



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,210	05/10/2001	Yoshimasa Suzuki	208267US3	3842

22850 7590 03/17/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

COOLEY, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1723

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/852,210

Applicant(s)
Suzuki et al.

Examiner
Charles Cooley

Art Unit
1723



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 Dec 2002
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 13 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1723

OFFICE ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 19 DEC 2003 has been entered.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. § 119, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

3. The abstract is acceptable.
4. The amended title of the invention is acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

5. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1723

Claim 1, line 8: does "a capsule holding chamber" have any relationship to the capsule holding chamber recited in line 4? Line 4 is worded in an awkward manner.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Randklev (USP 4,871,261).

Now that the mixer and capsule are claimed in combination, the patent to Randklev (USP 4,871,261) discloses a mixer 10 including a capsule 12 with a mixing compartment 22 for dental material therein; air-permeable filter 26 (col. 4, lines 17-24) placed as an outer wall forming a part of a peripheral wall of the mixing compartment (Fig. 1); a capsule holding chamber 18 which holds the capsule 12 in a portion other than a portion corresponding to the filter 26 (note the capsule 12 is physically held at area 42 which is spaced from the filter and an area 40 is also provided spaced from the filter 26 hence the capsule is not considered held at the portion corresponding to the filter 26); the capsule holding chamber 18 being connected to a vacuum device 54, 58.

Art Unit: 1723

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Randklev (USP 4,871,261) in view of Applicant' admitted prior art (AAPA).

Randklev (USP 4,871,261) discloses a vacuum device but does not disclose the vacuum device being an ejector connected to a compressed air supply device for a dental unit. Applicant' admitted prior art (Pages 19-20) teaches that a vacuum device can be a prior art ejector connected to a compressed air supply device for a known

Art Unit: 1723

dental unit, where the compressed air supply device for a known dental unit placed in a dental clinic can be used as the power source thereof. Accordingly, since the admitted prior art suggests that the vacuum source of claim 2 is a well known vacuum device used in the dental art, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to have substituted the vacuum device of Randklev (USP 4,871,261) with a prior art ejector connected to a compressed air supply device for a known dental unit for the purpose of lowering the complexity of the mixer and reducing the cost thereof by utilizing a typical on-site vacuum source in a dental clinic environment in which the mixer of Randklev (USP 4,871,261) would typically be implemented.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 3-6 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record does not teach or fairly suggest the recited configurations of the capsule, particularly the locations of the filter.

Art Unit: 1723

Response to Amendment

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by the newly presented combination claims.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Charles Cooley whose telephone number is ☎ (703) 308-0112.

16. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 1700 receptionist whose telephone number is ☎ (703) 308-0651.

Dated: 10 March 2003



**Charles Cooley
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723**